

SHUMAKER & SIEFFERT, P.A.  
8425 SEASONS PARKWAY, SUITE 105  
ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA 55125  
TEL 651.735-1100  
FAX 651.735-1102  
WWW.SSIPLAW.COM

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
NOV 13 2006

---

**FACSIMILE SUBMISSION UNDER 37 CFR 1.8**

---

TO:	FROM:
Mail Stop Petitions	Daniel T. Lund
COMPANY:	DATE:
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office	NOVEMBER 13, 2006
FAX NUMBER:	TOTAL NO. OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER:
1-571-273-8300	5
PHONE NUMBER:	SENDER'S REFERENCE NUMBER:
	1081-037US01/STL9833
RE:	APPLICATION SERIAL NUMBER:
Petition to Rescind the Finality of the Office Action	09/938,144

---

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
NOV 13 2006

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

PATENT

Applicant: Robert B. Wood Confirmation No. 1721  
Serial No.: 09/938,144  
Filed: August 23, 2001 Customer No.: 28863  
Examiner: Ilwoo Park  
Group Art Unit: 2182  
Docket No.: 1081-037US01/STL9833  
Title: INTELLIGENT DATA STORAGE DEVICE

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8 I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on November 13, 2006.

By: 

Name: Patricia Cygan

PETITION TO RESCIND FINALITY OF THE OFFICE ACTION

Mail Stop: Petitions  
Commissioner for Patents  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Applicant hereby petitions the Director of the USPTO to rescind the finality of the Final Office Action mailed September 11, 2006 under CFR §1.181. Applicant objects to the finality of the Office Action dated September 11, 2006 as being premature. Under MPEP 1002.02(c), this petition is to be decided by the Technology Center Director.

Applicant submits the following remarks in support of this petition:

I. A Final Office Action providing a new ground of rejection that is neither necessitated by applicant's amendment of the claims nor based on information submitted in an information disclosure statement is not proper.

The relevant rule regarding the finality of Office Actions is set out in MPEP 706.07(a):

Application Number 09/938,144

Petition to Rescind the Finality of the Office Action mailed September 11, 2006

Under present practice, second or any subsequent actions on the merits shall be final, except where the examiner introduces a new ground of rejection that is neither necessitated by applicant's amendment of the claims nor based on information submitted in an information disclosure statement filed during the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.97(c) with the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(p).

Applicant discussed the finality of Office Action dated September 11, 2006 first with the Examiner, Ilwoo Park and later with his supervisor, Kim Huynh on Monday November 13, 2006. Applicant argued that because the amendment submitted June 29, 2006 did not further limit the scope of claims 1 and 18 in any way, that the amendment could not have necessitated the new grounds of rejection of claims 1 and 18 as required for a proper Final Office Action. Kim Huynh disagreed with Applicant's understanding of the MPEP and indicated that because the scope of claims 1 and 18 had changed, the Office Action dated September 11, 2006 was properly final. Applicant finds no support in the MPEP or elsewhere for the proposition that an amendment that only broadens the scope of a claim can necessitate a new ground of rejection. Applicant respectfully submits that such a proposition is directly contrary to the clear meaning of the relevant rule regarding the finality of Office Actions as set out in MPEP 706.07(a).

**II. The new grounds of rejection was not based on information submitted in an information disclosure statement filed during the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.97(c).**

Applicant did not submit an information disclosure statement filed during the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.97(c); therefore, an information disclosure statement filed during the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.97(c) did not necessitate the new grounds of rejection.

**III. The Examiner provided a new grounds of rejection necessitated by an error in the Office Action dated March 1, 2006 and not by Applicant's amendment of the claims.**

The Examiner failed to provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claims 1 and 18 in the Office Action dated March 1, 2006. Specifically, in the Office Action dated March 1, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Hacker, *MP3: The Definitive Guide*, published March 2000 (hereinafter "Hacker") in view of Bruner et al. (USPN 6,212,588). In Applicant's amendment submitted June 29, 2006, Applicant

Application Number 09/938,144

Petition to Rescind the Finality of the Office Action mailed September 11, 2006

pointed out the Examiner's error in failing to provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claims 1 and 18 using Hacker in view of Bruner et al.

The Examiner provided a new grounds of rejection in the Final Office Action dated September 11, 2006. Specifically, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stefanksky (US 6,226,143). By rejecting claims 1 and 18 under a new grounds of rejection, the Examiner implicitly agreed with Applicant in that the Examinee did not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claims 1 and 18 in the Office Action dated March 1, 2006.

In Applicant's amendment submitted June 29, 2006, Applicant amended claims 1 and 18 by deleting features not necessary to distinguish the Applicant's invention as recited claims 1 and 18 over the prior art of record at that time. Importantly, Applicant did not add any of the features recited in claims 1 and 18 in the amendment submitted June 29, 2006. For example, Applicant amended claim 1 as shown below:

Claim 1 (Currently Amended): A data storage device in a form factor assembly not greater than three and one half inches comprising:  
a data disc rotatably mounted on a baseplate;  
an actuator arm adjacent to the data disc carrying a transducer for reading data from and writing data to the data disc;  
a printed circuit board (PCB) fastened to the baseplate having a servo controller in operable communication with the actuator arm for moving the actuator arm over the data disc; and  
a central processing unit (CPU) mounted to the PCB generating control signals to the servo controller and running an operating system; and  
memory storing an application program operably connected to the CPU, whereby the application program is run by the CPU.

Because Applicant did not add any features in claim 1 or claim 18, it is clear that Applicant's amendments only broadened the subject matter of claims 1 and 18. If the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Hacker in view of Bruner et al. of claims 1 and 18 prior to the broadening amendment had properly supported the rejection, the same grounds of rejection would have also supported a rejection of claims 1 and 18 as broadened after the amendment. For this reason, Applicant's amendment submitted June 29, 2006 could not have necessitated the new grounds of rejection in set for the in the Final Office Action with respect to at least claims 1 and 18.

Application Number 09/938,144

Petition to Rescind the Finality of the Office Action mailed September 11, 2006

#### IV. Conclusion


In the Office Action dated September 11, 2006, the Examiner introduced a new ground of rejection not necessitated by Applicant's amendment of the claims nor based on information submitted in an information disclosure statement filed during the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.97(c). For this reason, the Office Action dated September 11, 2006 properly should be designated as non-final. Applicant respectfully requests the Director rescind the finality of the Office Action dated September 11, 2006.

No fee is believed due at this time. If any fee is required for consideration of this petition, please charge deposit account number 50-1778 the amount required for consideration of this petition. Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to deposit account number 50-1778.

Date:

November 13, 2006  
SHUMAKER & SIEFFERT, P.A.  
8425 Seasons Parkway, Suite 105  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55125  
Telephone: 651.735.1100  
Facsimile: 651.735.1102

By:

  
Name: Daniel T. Lund  
Reg. No.: 58,614